UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/922,209	08/03/2001	John David West Brothers	9339/34809	7950

24728   7590   12/10/2008
MORRIS MANNING MARTIN LLP
3343 PEACHTREE ROAD, NE
1600 ATLANTA FINANCIAL CENTER
ATLANTA, GA 30326

EXAMINER
HOSSAIN, TANIM M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2445	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/10/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 September 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *9 and 32-38* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) *1-8, 10-31 and 39-60* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *9 and 32-38* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

This application contains claims 1-8, 10-31, and 39-60 drawn to an invention nonelected

with traverse in the reply filed on September 1, 2008. A complete reply to the final rejection

must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See

MPEP § 821.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levergood (U.S.

2008/0201344).

As per claim 9, Levergood teaches a method comprising the steps of: (a) receiving a

signal at a web server requesting a web page document from a web access device (WAD), the

signal including an Internet protocol (IP) address of the WAD (paragraphs 0012-0018); (b)

retrieving data for the requested web page document including a universal resource locator

(URL) of one or more resources referenced in the requested web page document (0012-0018);

(c) retrieving resource access right data for each resource URL referenced in the requested web page document using the IP address of the (WAD) and/or user name and password established through a log-in procedure (0038-0041); (d) generating hash and/or encrypted data to generate secure resource access right data for each resource URL referenced in the requested web page document (0038-0041); (e) combining the secure resource access right data for each resource URL with the respective resource URL to generate a secure resource URL for each resource URL referenced in the requested web page document (0033); (f) generating the requested web page document including the secure resource URL(s) that can be used by the WAD to generate a request for each resource (0038-0041); (g) transmitting the web page document including the secure resource URL(s) to the WAD (0038-0041); and wherein steps (b)-(g) are performed at the web server after receiving the signal from the WAD (0012-0018, 0038-0041). While Levergood teaches that the processes (b)-(g) are performed after receiving the signal at the web server, the reference does not specifically teach that the processes (b)-(g) take place immediately after, and in response to (i.e. because of) receiving the signal at the web server. Official notice is taken that the processes may be triggered by a receiving a request signal, rather than being able to stand alone on their own, or simply coming chronologically after receiving of the request signal. Such a modification constitutes and obvious design choice, such that the receiving of the signal is required before the processes (b)-(g) may take place. Many computer processes in the art require a certain process to occur before it may move on to execute a subsequent process. Therefore, to disclose this requirement in Levergood would have been envisioned by one of ordinary skill.

Claims 32-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levergood

(U.S. 2008/0201344) in view of Smith (U.S. 6,529,956).

As per claim 32, Levergood teaches the limitations similar to claim 9, but does not

specifically teach the remaining key verification steps in the explicit manner as claimed. Smith

teaches verifying whether key data is valid based on data corresponding to the key data in a

secure content key database (Smith: 13; 60-65); if the key data is verified as valid in step (i),

generating hash data based on at least the IP address, URL, and the key data (Smith: 15; 57-62,

16; 15-25); verifying that the hash data generated in step (j) matches the hash data included in

the request signal received in the step (h) (Smith: 15; 30-40); and wherein the steps are

performed at the web server in response to the received signals from the WAD (on the basis of

obviousness as discussed in the treatment of claim 9 in view of Levergood). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the specific key

data validity considerations, as taught by Smith into the access control system of Levergood.

The motivation for doing so lies in the fact that enabling the specific key checking systems

would create a more secure access control system. Further, both inventions are from the same

access control field.

As per claim 33, Levergood-Smith teaches the method as claimed in claim 32, further

comprising the steps of: terminating the request signal if the verifying of the step (k) indicates

that the hash data generated in the step (j) does not match the hash data included in the request

signal received in the step (h) (Smith: 13; 60-65).

As per claim 34, Levergood-Smith teaches the method as claimed in claim 33, further

comprising the steps of: determining whether access to a resource is to be provided to a device

identified by the IP address, based on the resource access right data included in the request signal (Smith: 15; 57-62, 16; 15-25); and providing access to the resource to a device identified by the IP address if the determining of the step (m) indicates that access to the resource is to be provided (Smith: 15; 57-62, 16; 15-25).

As per claim 35, Levergood-Smith teaches the method as claimed in claim 34, further comprising the steps of: retrieving resource access right data from a database, the determining of step (m) based further on whether the IP address of the request signal is authorized to access the resource indicated by the URL of the request signal, based on the retrieved resource access right data (Smith: 13; 60-65).

As per claim 36, Levergood-Smith teaches the method as claimed in claim 32, wherein the request signal received in step (h) includes key index data, the method further comprising the step of: retrieving the key data from the secure content key database using key index data (Smith: 13; 32-46).

As per claims 37 and 38, Levergood-Smith teaches the method as claimed in claim 32, but does not specifically teach time-to-live considerations in dealing with the validity of key data. Official notice is taken that the consideration of time-based data in creating and using keys is well known in the art of key generation and manipulation (Please see paragraph 373 of U.S. 2004/0170176, as an example). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include time-to-live considerations in the system of Levergood-Smith, to allow for situations where sessions may be timed out, so that security is maintained.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on September 1, 2008 have fully been considered, and are respectfully traversed by the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tanim Hossain whose telephone number is (571)272-3881. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on 571/272-3949. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tanim Hossain
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2445

       /Larry D Donaghue/
       Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2454